



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Princeton University Library



32101 045395116

AP

HD5473
.058

1054 (3) (RECAP)
058

Library of
Princeton University.



The Eighty Eight Library
of
Economics.

10

SABOTAGE

OR

Socialism vs. Syndicalism

A CRITICAL STUDY OF THEORIES
AND METHODS

By **JAMES ONEAL**,
Author of "THE WORKERS IN AMERICAN HISTORY," "MILITANT SOCIALISM," ETC.

COPYRIGHT 1913

The National Rip-Saw Publishing Co.
SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

Rip-Saw Series No. 20; Price 10c



115



FOREWORD.

In presenting this booklet it is hoped that the reader will overlook any crudities of style and arrangement of material, as it has been written hurriedly in the stress of a big campaign and during the few hours each evening that I could give to it. I have thought it wise, since the subject is a controversial one, to indicate the various publications consulted in preparing the book. My attitude toward Syndicalism is frankly critical; it seems to me that the general viewpoint of Syndicalism or the New Revisionism is the most shallow that the Socialist movement has ever faced.

JAMES ONEAL,

September, 1912.

Terre Haute, Ind.



SABOTAGE

or, Socialism vs. Syndicalism

By JAMES ONEAL

I. Historical.

No one who reads current Socialist literature will fail to note a distinct tendency in some quarters in favor of policies that have come to be known in this and other countries as Syndicalism. Its advocates were rather vague at first and today are far from giving a clear outline of what they stand for and what they oppose, or would modify in the Socialist Party. In fact, as will be shown later, some of its prominent advocates in defending Syndicalism have shown by their utterances that they have merely caught a few phrases such as "direct action," or "Socialism with its working clothes on," and captivated by these phrases they have called themselves Syndicalists without any conception of what the term means.

The old revisionists who have gathered around Bernstein in Germany and other countries in a sincere effort to revise the revolutionary doctrines of international Socialism, have one thing in common that distinguishes them from the new revisionists. Bernstein and his colleagues brought with them a thorough understanding of Marxism, though disagreeing with Marx in certain particulars. They brought with them a wealth of knowledge, keen insight, subtle criticism and historical perspective that marked them as brilliant men. This will be conceded by their opponents as well as their friends. In fact so thoroughly did Bernstein and his leading supporters prepare for their task that it taxed the resources of revolutionists like Kautsky, Bebel, Liebknecht and others to follow them in all their subtle by-plays of logic and argument. It is the personal opinion of the writer that the old revisionism is, on the whole, wrong, but at the same time he is willing to concede that criticism from this source is the most brilliant and able that the Socialist movement has withstood.¹

Not so with the new revisionists, or Syndicalists. They have created no literature outside of a few works in France, while in this country they have no common understanding. There seems to be as many views of Syndicalism as there are Syndicalists. One of its leading monthly publications in an editorial defense of "Sabotage," lacking a clear understanding of the word, had to quote a conservative Boston daily paper which professed to define it.² The same publication has contained numerous articles bearing on questions related to the policies of Syndicalism that are frequently contradictory. One writer even affirms that the labor resolution adopted by the National Convention of the Socialist Party at Indianapolis in 1912, commits the party to the "revolutionary tactics of insatiable Syndicalism!"³ When it is borne in mind that the resolution in question contains, as will be shown later, absolutely nothing that favors any phase of Syndicalism, we have an excellent contrast between the brilliancy of the old re-

¹ See Inside Back Cover for Notes.

visionism and the intellectual poverty of the new. Reckless assertions and radical phrases bearing a close kinship to the utterances of the intellectual fathers of Anarchism, are characteristic of the new revisionism. It is totally lacking in that appeal to history and careful analysis of contemporary economic development which distinguishes the Bernstein reformists. Coming in the name of Marx it is a caricature of all that the latter wrote and all that he strove for and that finally brought him to his grave.

The development of Syndicalism in America is a recent phenomenon, yet, crude and ill-defined as it still is, it has had seven years in this country to reach its present status in numerical strength and doctrinal beliefs. It is closely related to the old differences in the Socialist movement regarding the attitude the Socialist Party should sustain toward the organizations of labor that struggle for shorter hours, higher wages and general improvement of the lot of the workers under capitalism. The development of Syndicalism in France and exaggerated accounts of its alleged achievements that have appeared in some of the Socialist publications of this country, have also had a marked influence in winning sympathy and support in some quarters for it. But even among those who profess to be Syndicalists and who retain membership in the Socialist Party there seems to be no realization that such membership is in contradiction to their professed beliefs. Still less do they seem capable of tracing the movement of Syndicalism to its origin or to forecast its ultimate consequences. If it had developed in the United States and the same type of men that worked out its theoretical basis in France had worked it out here, it would surprise some of our Syndicalists to learn that instead of Socialists like Eugene V. Debs, Ben Hanford, John Spargo, Algernon Lee, Ernest Untermann or A. M. Simons being its fathers, the only type in this country that would correspond with the Syndicalist "philosophers" of France would be Johann Most, Abraham Isaacs, Emma Goldman and other "libertarian" followers of Proudhon, Kropotkin or Bakunin. It does not occur to the Socialist Syndicalist—which, by the way, is a contradiction in terms—that if he can accept the Syndicalist "philosophy" then he has achieved something that Marx and Engels and their colleagues in the International Workingmen's Association regarded as impossible, that is, a reconciliation between Anarchism and Socialism. A further analogy is that just as the brilliant Paul Lafargue, Jules Guesde and other well-known Socialists of France have had to oppose Syndicalism because they knew its history, its theoretical basis and its exponents, so it is apparent that with a like history here the well-known comrades mentioned above would naturally be found, as they are now, opposed to the new revisionism and the new revisionists.

A better understanding of this Syndicalist tendency may be had by briefly reviewing the history of the relations between the Socialist movement and the trades unions of this country. Many Socialists who have become such in recent years are not aware of our past struggles over tactical differences regarding the relations of the party to the trades unions and which often divided Socialists into bitter factions.

The once promising Socialist Labor Party received a steady increase in its vote, beginning with 2,068 in 1888, and reaching its maximum of 82,204 in 1898. Since then its vote has declined until it reached about 15,000 in 1910. In spite of the increasing antagonism of classes, the development of trusts, the centralization of wealth and the increasing discontent of the working class, the Socialist Labor Party miserably failed to reach the workers, secure their confidence and enlist their support. The period of its decline is practically identical with a change in its attitude towards the workers organized in the unions. It had maintained a friendly attitude toward the labor unions, assisting them in their struggles and always voicing a protest against every outrage perpetrated against them. Its increasing vote and membership, as well as the history and experience of the Socialist movement of Europe, all testified to the soundness of this policy.

But in 1895 Daniel De Leon, editor of the official organ of the Socialist Labor Party, became involved in a quarrel with Master Workman J. R. Sovereign, of the Knights of Labor, and under De Leon's skillful leadership the Socialist Labor Party abandoned its sympathetic attitude toward the labor unions and ranged the Socialists in bitter antagonism to all unions not controlled by them. The work of education within the unions was deliberately abandoned as useless. The shortcomings, mistakes and failures of the unions; sometimes the dishonesty and frequently the blunders of leaders were mercilessly criticised. This developed into a mania among most of its partisans. The daily press and the publications of the unions were carefully read and the slightest incident that could be twisted into a defense of this policy was used. Perhaps no other movement in America ever witnessed such a volume of vindictive utterances. Hatred and frenzy possessed its speakers so that it became positively painful, and often disgusting, to listen to their diatribes.⁴

All this, of course, was justified by an appeal to science and history. It was held that "boring within" the unions was folly as they were infested with "labor fakirs" and "labor lieutenants of capital" and must therefore be "smashed" by the "fighting S. L. P." To assist in the work of destruction the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance was born almost in a night. No previous general discussion of the advisability of this was held; the membership of the Socialist Labor Party was not consulted. It did not spring from the grim economic necessity of the working class, but from the brain of Daniel De Leon. It "was the most unique example of a Socialist trade union anti-pure-and-simple organization in the annals of labor history, inasmuch as it was neither trade union nor Socialistic, nor pure, nor simple, in the true sense of the words."⁵ It was the concrete expression of the vengeance felt by its author and partisans against the unions that refused to be led or driven to embrace Socialist views. Members who refused to endorse the new policies were expelled and sometimes whole sections and state organizations were expelled for "treason" if they criticized these policies.

The net result of this vindictive attitude was to range the great mass of organized workers in bitter opposition to Socialism, and to this day Socialists are sometimes called upon to

explain this phase of Socialist history. After a brief career the S. T. and L. A. disappeared while the vote and the membership of the Socialist Labor Party have dwindled to insignificance. In other words, the Socialist Labor Party, confronted with a magnificent opportunity, in a country with great contrasts between wealth and poverty, and a growing unrest among the workers, miserably failed to enlist the support of the working class. While the Socialist Parties of Europe were making steady gains, the S. L. P. sustained continued losses as its policy became generally known. No amount of "scientific" pleading will avail against this one supreme fact, as experience is the one test of the soundness of any policy.

It is unnecessary to review the history of the subsequent "splits" in the S. L. P. due to this policy. Suffice it to say, that large numbers of its membership were aware from its inception of the disaster that awaited the S. L. P. and the S. T. & L. A. Any movement that professes to represent the working class and at the same time wages a vindictive warfare against the first forms of working class resistance, is not scientific and is doomed to failure. It does not matter that the union membership lacks a Socialist consciousness, that it does not appreciate or understand the limitations of the union, that it makes blunders, that some of its leaders may be ignorant, dishonest or corrupt, it still remains a fact that the membership is drawn from the ranks of the exploited and that their exploitation and experience in the class war, with the patient and sympathetic co-operation of class conscious Socialists, must all co-operate in the end to bring them into closer unity and to direct their efforts to the conquest of the governing powers and thus emancipate themselves. If this policy does not make revolutionists of workingmen we may rest assured that an attitude of contempt, ridicule and antagonism never will.

The decline of the S. L. P. proceeded with the rise of the Social Democratic Party, at first divided into two organizations which united at the Unity Convention, in Indianapolis, and formed the Socialist Party in 1901. A fraternal policy toward the labor organizations was adopted and the organization has continued to increase in membership and votes. The party has assisted the unions with funds in every important crisis regardless of whether such unions accepted the Socialist programme or not. Professing to represent the whole working class, the Socialist Party has aided conservative and revolutionary unions, craft and industrial unions. It has aided the conservative American Federation of Labor, collected funds, and held mass meetings to assist its officers in their defense before capitalist courts, even when those officers have frequently denounced the Socialist Party. It has followed this policy not because the particular officers favored or opposed Socialism, but because we wish to preserve as much freedom of action for the workers as possible in the unions. The loss of any measure of freedom by the unions under Samuel Gompers would still be a loss if he was succeeded by a Socialist who would have the weakened organization transferred to him. The Socialist Party has assisted Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone of the Western Federation of Miners when that or-

ganization was opposing the A. F. of L. It has helped the A. F. of L. in many struggles and even the unorganized, as at McKees Rocks. It helped in the defense of Ettor and Giovanitti at Lawrence, Mass. Always for the working class as against its exploiters, no matter what particular organization the workers happen to represent in any given crisis. At the same time it seeks a closer unity of all workers and regards it as the duty of all Socialist members in the unions to use their best judgment in breaking down all barriers to complete solidarity and to help in forming a militant class consciousness among union men for the overthrow of capitalism.

It may be conceded that many unions are slow in approaching a closer unity through industrial organization, but this is only another reason why the Socialist members should be all the more active in pointing out the defects of organization, and for the party to aid in all union struggles. Capitalist development is slowly wiping out craft divisions and the unions must and will adapt their organizations to the changes. The increasing jurisdiction struggles show that economic development is disturbing every backward union. As Socialists we know that there is absolutely no solution of jurisdiction questions except through a gradual approach toward industrial organization. Attempts to preserve backward forms of organization only aggravate the problems of jurisdiction and make the necessity for industrial organization clearer than ever. It is not because we wish it that industrial unionism will come, but because the wish is enforced and made possible and necessary by the economic development.

In other words, the position of the Socialist party is founded on the reality of the capitalist world in which we live. One of the realities found in the unions is that the membership is also composed of Democrats, Republicans, Socialists and men of other political beliefs. For this reason the party asserts that political differences should not divide the working class in its struggles with the capitalist class. It would be disaster, even treason, to call attention to the political differences in the unions when the latter are on strike. It would mean to divide the workers in favor of their exploiters. This does not mean that in the normal business and educational work of the unions the Socialist members should not educate their fellows in accord with Socialist views. On the contrary, the Socialist should take advantage of every opportunity to draw the Socialist moral in every vital question before the union, always being careful not to make himself a nuisance or a bore. And just as political questions should not endanger the solidarity of the working class in the shop, mine and factory, so questions of industrial organization should not be allowed to threaten Socialist solidarity at the ballot box. All theorizing must square itself with the reality of the class struggle. A given union may be antiquated in its form of organization; its leaders may be very conservative and the membership conservative also. But if these conservative union workers happen to be street car employes, for example, and either strike or are locked out by the employing corporation, all theories are tested by one grim reality. The classes are at war, and the question with you and me is not whether these workers are Socialists,

industrialists, or craft unionists, but whether we will ride the cars. If you ride you aid the exploiters; if you walk you oppose them. You cannot even be indifferent. You will walk or ride, and thus, whether you want to or not, you become a factor in the class struggle. The only way to escape the reality of the class struggle is to leave civilization and live the life of a hermit.

Now just because the policy of the Socialist Party has been in harmony with the material reality of the class war; because it has never allowed theory to lead it away from reality to abstract speculation, it is a growing working class party and will continue to be such as long as it observes this genuine scientific policy. Kautsky, who recognizes the backwardness of some unions, does not allow his resentment to blind his judgment. Of the most aristocratic unions he writes: "As mechanical production advances, one craft after another is tumbled into the abyss of common labor. This fact is constantly teaching even the most effectively organized divisions that in the long run their position is dependent upon the strength of the working class as a whole. They come to the conclusion that it is a mistaken policy to attempt to rise on the shoulders of those who are sinking in a quicksand. They come to see that the struggles of other divisions of the proletariat are by no means foreign to them."⁶

On the other hand, the same revolutionists of the proletariat do not overestimate the power of an industrially organized working class. It is by no means invincible, as some would assure us. Although presenting a better fighting front to the exploiting classes than the craft unions, the industrial union cannot add any new economic weapons that are not now employed. The industrial union draws ever larger masses within the zone of labor struggles, wipes out the survivals of antiquated forms of organization and by embracing the workers of an entire industry it promotes the growth of solidarity and class unity. But like the backward unions the industrial union must rely on the strike, boycott and mutual aid to win in any struggle. It has the same powerful ruling class, with mighty resources back of it, to face. It must contend with the courts, police, militia and spies the same as the craft union, and because of the "living wage" that goes to all sellers of labor power the industrial unionists find in a long strike that their resources of life will on the whole last but little longer than those of the craft unionists. "Hunger will compel capitulation," as one exploiter expressed it. More solidarity and greater power go with industrial unionism, but no new weapons are discovered or used. Increased solidarity tends to a more rapid development of a Socialist consciousness, and so adding to the objective of the industrial union the complete overthrow of capitalism and co-operating with the Socialist Party for that purpose. But this additional objective has also been proclaimed by many non-industrial unions, so that it is not necessarily a characteristic of the industrial union. The latter cannot afford to adopt a Socialist political objective any more than the craft union can until a Socialist consciousness has permeated a large portion of its membership. Experience teaches that Socialist resolutions

adopted by the unions do not lead the non-Socialist members to vote for Socialism.

Here again we recognize the limitations imposed on the working class by the world of capitalism. We cannot leap out of economic conditions and soar in a world of theories unrelated to them, or disregard the limitations imposed by economic evolution. To attempt it is to become Utopians. We may recognize the reactionary part that some representatives of labor unions play in associating at banquet tables with the exploiters; we may recognize and oppose their conservative counsels, but when such "leaders" receive no strong rebuke from the members, candor compels us to recognize this also. And to recognize this fact, even though it be disagreeable, is to admit that the degree of Socialist consciousness has not become strong enough to find effective expression in such unions. When it has developed sufficiently we may be sure it will be forcibly heard. At the National Convention, in 1904, Delegate Sievermann of New York spoke forcibly to this point when the report of the Committee on Trades Unions was before the convention.

"There is no lack of material," said Sievermann, "to prove that in the trades unions movement there are corruptionists galore, nor is there any lack of material to prove that if the Socialist trades unionists were to take a keener, more active and more thorough interest in their trades unions, that these corrupt elements would be sooner or later driven out of the trades union field. * * * This trades union movement is the economic expression of the working class in the economic field. You cannot ignore this fact out of existence. This conflict is here. You, as the chosen, the self-appointed champions, if you please, of the interests of the working class, you cannot escape going on record for or against the working class in their struggle with capital. You may hide behind whatever subterfuge you elect, but the trades unionists upon this field will drag you forth and will make you take a stand for or against labor in this economic field." 7

The convention of 1904 adopted resolutions endorsing this view, asserting that the unions are a natural product of capitalism; that the workers must "fortify and permanently secure by their political power what they have wrung from their exploiters in the economic struggle;" that "neither political nor other differences of opinion justify the division of the forces of labor in the industrial movement," and that the "exploitation of labor will only cease when the working class shall own all the means of production and distribution." This position has been reaffirmed by subsequent conventions, the convention of 1912 adding a favorable reference to industrial unionism. The Socialist Party has carried out its expressed policy faithfully in every struggle of the working class. Financial aid and support has been given to both A. F. of L. and I. W. W. organizations, even when officials or prominent members of them have opposed the party, the A. F. of L. representatives because they oppose Socialistic political action, and the I. W. W. because some of them favor what they call "direct action." In either case the party has kept in mind that each struggle has not been one affecting merely the welfare of a few leaders or representatives, but affecting the welfare and in

terests of large bodies of workers whose freedom of action and economic security are essential to the final triumph of the whole working class. To desert any section of the working class in its struggle because a few or even all its leaders oppose the Socialist movement is to assist the capitalist class in the work of permanently binding the workers to capitalist exploitation as the serfs were bound to feudalism.

It is hardly necessary to point out that this policy of the Socialist Party is identical with the policy of the Socialist Parties of the world. To depart from it would be to confess that we are mere politicians seeking votes; that when the workers fail to vote with the Socialists after receiving our aid we refuse to aid them any more and that our support shall be extended only to the Socialist unions. But we are not bourgeois politicians. The tragedy of proletarian life is a terrible reality for us, and the fact that many non-Socialist proletarians share in it and ignorantly support the source of their exploitation only makes the tragedy more keen and all the more reason why we should support them in their struggles, even though they give us no support in ours. We say in our resolutions "we are for the working class." We do not add the qualification, "providing, you give us your votes." Capitalist politicians may consistently do this, but Socialists cannot if they are sincere in their professions of regard for the welfare of the working class. We know that our continued assistance to the working class must in time awaken even the dullest and most prejudiced to the fact that the Socialist Party is the party of working class emancipation. At any rate, unless a large majority of them reach this conclusion the Socialist movement is hopeless. How may we then expect them to reach this understanding unless we continue the sympathetic relations we have fostered for years?

Nor does this policy commit the party to any of the practices or views of any reactionary "leaders" in the unions. We have no responsibility for such practices or views. We do not support them. We support the workers, their issues and their struggles, in spite of reactionary leaders, who would be only too glad if we would not extend our aid. In rendering assistance to the workers in their struggles we at least secure their good will, later their confidence and, finally their support for the social revolution is won. Reactionary leaders would be content if we should fail to assist in these struggles, as there would then be no sympathetic ties between the class conscious proletarians and the misled non-Socialist unionists. Failure to help or indifference on the part of Socialists strengthens non-Socialist leadership in the unions. We would play into the hands of such leadership if we departed from our policy. Socialism has become a power to be reckoned with in America because of having followed the general policy outlined in this chapter.

II. Principles of Syndicalism.

There are three well-defined principles on which all genuine Syndicalists agree, although most of those who profess to be Syndicalists in the Socialist Party would hesitate to avow all three. The very fact that the latter are regarded as shamefaced syndicalists by the genuine article and that the

chief offense charged against them is that of accepting political action, shows that the "Socialist Syndicalist" has to go much farther than he does to be accepted by the Syndicalist fraternity. The three chief articles of faith may be stated as follows:

1. Uncompromising opposition to political action. The state is a class state and parliamentary activity throws elected workmen into intimate contact with politicians of the capitalist class. Workmen cannot remain in capitalist parliaments without being tainted with and being finally lured into the corrupt practices of a parliamentary regime. Capitalist society can be overthrown without sending workmen into this vicious environment.

2. Minority rule in the unions by the formation of militant groups, who are to plan policies and campaigns in accord with the principles of Syndicalism.

3. Constant warfare through strikes, ever wider in their scope, until they embrace a sufficient number of conscious Syndicalists who will, after many victories, use the unions to seize the industries and own and operate them as the property of the unions. The victories leading up to this final victory will have so weakened the capitalist state that their final conquest by the unions will be made possible. The State is to be abolished, together with its legislative bodies and other departments, as useless to the free groups possessing the industries.

It is not difficult for any one acquainted with Anarchist literature to trace the source of these "principles." Neither is it difficult to give historic reasons why these views should develop at the particular time they did in France. The first two, rejection of political action and majority rule, are common to Anarchism. The third, seizure of industry by the unions, is a recent development growing out of historical causes which we will consider later. The conception of the unions as free groups of producers after the final conquest of capitalism also bears a close resemblance to the "autonomous groups" we read so much of in Anarchist literature. All this is plain to one having the slightest acquaintance with these writings, but one will be puzzled to understand what warrant William English Walling has for saying that "the new view of the syndicalists also contains at times the best, entirely fresh and up-to-date restatement of Marxism we have had for many years; indeed, it has almost brought about a rebirth of Marxism among the masses in many countries."¹ If Marx or Marxists have ever stood sponsor for anything resembling the above views, then the well-known Socialists of the world, as well as the Socialist parties, have completely misunderstood Marx and his writings. They constitute not a rebirth, but an abortion: not a restatement, but a contrast.

The embryo Syndicalist generally begins his career by losing faith in political action and parliamentary activity and by overestimating the power of economic action. This is the stage reached at the present writing by those who call themselves syndicalists in the United States, but who give sufficient endorsement of political action to retain their membership, in the Socialist Party. The endorsement is feeble enough and enables them to speak of "direct action" and to decry

political methods as the art of "politicians." Thus Tom Mann, the British Socialist, after years of splendid activity in Australia, finally laid undue emphasis on industrial unionism. Returning to England, in recent years this conviction became more pronounced, until today he affirms that "with the workers properly organized there is nothing that they may not successfully demand from the capitalists by means of a general strike."² One holding this view of the sweeping power of any form of unionism may easily reach the conclusion that political action is useless and parliamentary activity a snare. His drift to this conviction will be all the swifter if for the moment he is able to point to some neglect or blunder or apostasy of a Socialist representative in a legislative body. When he completes the circle he finds himself in agreement with the most reactionary of labor leaders, who also oppose Socialist political action. It is not the first time that reactionary and ultra-revolutionist found themselves keeping company.

Syndicalists accept the class war in common with Socialists, but have their own interpretation of it and their own methods of fighting the class struggle. The Socialist views it as a phase of history and a call to the workers for an intelligent struggle against the capitalist class for supremacy. The Syndicalist views it as a guerilla war against the capitalist class and goes back to the blind methods employed by the workers in the infancy of capitalism, glorifies them and, translating this policy into French, calls it "Sabotage." The first forms of working class revolt against capitalism were attacks on labor-saving machinery. It was instinctive, blind resentment rather than cool, intelligent action based on a knowledge of the evolution of capitalist society. Even today many proletarians who lack a Socialist class consciousness resort to this method of attack and as frequently injure their fellow workmen as they do the employers. The writer remembers an instance when the laborers in a certain iron and steel industry resented an increase in hours from nine to ten and an increase of only one cent in wages for the additional hour. They practiced "sabotage" by turning out inferior material. When this material reached several hundred other workers in another department, who were working at a tonnage rate, the bad material ruined the finished product to such an extent that their tonnage was thereby reduced to 25 and 30 per cent. and their wages fell accordingly. They worked as hard with bad material as the good and received absolutely nothing for it. The workers in one department were thus made the victims of the "sabotage" practiced by those in another. Any man with a proletarian experience can remember hundreds of incidents of this blind, instinctive "sabotage" practiced by proletarians who had absolutely no idea that they were the pioneers of the "new revisionism." They were active in capitalist parties, or at least voted the tickets of the employing classes against whom they directed their vandalism. The ideal "sabotager" is the pious Irish Catholic supporting the rotten Democratic party and working as a railroad section hand. He has been the butt of much ridicule because of his interest in the landscape rather than the gravel under the tie, but he never suspected that some day he would be raised to the dignity of a philosopher of Syndicalism!

But sabotage includes something more than the action of our Irish Catholic "soldiering on the job." His is a harmless form of sabotage and has been practiced since wage-payment came into the world, with the rise of capitalism. His action requires no revolutionary sanction. His conservation of his labor power, giving as little of it as possible for the wage received, is a normal practice of proletarians and is due to the lack of incentive under capitalism. He follows the universal law of the exchange of commodities by giving as little as possible and taking as much as he can get. It is due to a recognition of this law by employing capitalists that "scientific management" is being introduced in industry, and standards of work, output and quality are being established for wage workers.

The sabotage that we have in mind is that which proposes the destruction of machinery, railways, arsenals, etc., a guerilla vandalism that leads to riot, that provokes brutal police and military power and reactionary interference by officials of the government. The Syndicalist regards this as "striking on the job." It has two advantages, according to him. It enables the striker to stay at work and draw wages and does not give the employing capitalists an opportunity to substitute strike breakers. Damaging or destroying products or machinery while "striking on the job" until the capitalist grants the demands of the strikers constitute the "militant tactics" of Syndicalism. It is not denied that this will provoke the police and military. But what of that. The main exponent of Syndicalism in America faces this and asserts: "They (the strikers) will soon learn that a strike is a battle in the true sense of the word, and, while in these modern battles the guns and bayonets are against them, their power to 'raise general hell' is a far more formidable weapon, against which the army and police are about as effective as is a broom to sweep back the rising tide."³

Splendid assurance, this. Armed police and soldiers trained for their grim work are ineffective if strikers will only "raise general hell." It seems almost incomprehensible that sane men can invite wage workers to this welter of unreasoning suicide in the name of revolution. Is it not one of the "glories" of the capitalist state that it is capable of suppressing any "general hell" that desperate workers may "raise" and so give a sense of security to the classes of "law and order?" One of the lessons that the working-class in modern nations have learned is that deliberate violence can only be systematically practiced by the ruling classes. When indulged in by the workers it proves demoralizing and reactionary. So well do the ruling classes appreciate this that it is a common practice with them to hire detectives, whose purpose it is to encourage strikers to "raise hell," in order that police and military may be called to break the strike.

Max Baginski, a German Syndicalist, also recognizes that the practice of sabotage must provoke the use of police and military powers. His solution of the question is to finally starve out the capitalist class. He says: "With the power of the general strike, the proletariat is able to starve out the bourgeois, including their system of law and order. There are people who will say: 'Yes, but the proletariat will be overcome with hunger before the propertied class.'" Baginski answers his own question as follows: "That is weak argument. Capitalist economy has created an entirely capitalistic morality, but the general strike

has its own morality, and its first paragraph sounds like this: 'The workingmen have the right to those products they have produced through their own energy.'"⁴ In other words, should it come to an actual possibility of the capitalist class, into whose hands the Syndicalist leaves all the police and military power, facing want, this class will be foolish enough not to use its power to secure food supplies! Opposed to police and military power will be the "morality of the general strike," which will somehow prove triumphant. And the reverse is weak argument!

As Plechanoff points out in the case of the Anarchists in his brilliant "Socialist vs. Anarchism," all that is necessary to accept the conclusions of their half-brothers is to "assume" certain premises and you will have no difficulty in disposing of "weak arguments." Two paragraphs following the one quoted from Baginski, he deplores the fact that the ruling classes use "the power of the government, with which they strike to the ground every resistance offered." What then becomes of the irresistible "morality of the general strike?" One moment it is invincible; the next moment it is struck to the ground by the vile bourgeoisie who refuse to recognize its power. Some one certainly has a "weak argument," but the bourgeois is certainly not worrying whose logic is at fault.

The reality of the state with its coercive powers is forced on Baginski and other Syndicalists, as we have shown. Sabotage destroys itself. To assume that a body of strikers can continue to "strike on the job" by remaining at work and destroying machinery and products, is to assume that the capitalist employers have not the power of closing their shops, declaring a lockout and using the police and army the moment this vandalism is known. One experience with sabotage will place the employers on guard, and any attempt to repeat it would merely provoke a lockout before any damage could be done.

The case has been well put by Joseph Cohen in an article in the Socialist press in June, 1912. "Sabotage is bred of the idea that the worker can improve his condition by stealth and secrecy," he writes. "Sabotage is on a plane with the notion of the small shopkeeper who imagines he can become a millionaire by sanding his sugar. It is on a level with the idea of a small-fry manufacturer who can see himself becoming a great captain of industry by cheap adulteration.

"We think the working class can do better than to go to the upper classes for morality. The upper classes have none to spare of the right kind. The kind they have in abundance, the workers can do better without.

"Violence and crime, indulged in by all elements of the ruling classes in acquiring their accumulations, are equally reactionary when picked up by the workers. Violence and crime, of course, cannot be defended by argument—they are the absence of argument. Sabotage, violence and crime are an unholy trinity that can serve only minorities. It is folly to imagine that a whole union, for instance, could employ this trinity without it dawning upon even the dull wits of the ruling class. Once it is publicly known its serviceability passes away. Only parlor Socialists are permitted to suggest such tactics publicly and be free from apprehension by the police."

✓ A riot is not a revolution; sabotage is not waging the class struggle. It is the street insurrection of the muddled utopians

before the days of the Communist Manifesto. It is a reversion back to the days when it was thought that street revolts planned by "revolutionary" minorities could overthrow capitalism. Marx directed some of his keenest satire and most convincing argument against these hot heads in the International Workingmen's Association.

On the other hand, besides being fruitless and reactionary, the practice of sabotage leads to brutality and coarse instincts among the working class. Deliberate vandalism has no place in a revolutionary movement that claims to raise unthinking proletarians to the status of human beings. "We are armed with the culture of our century," cried Lasalle. Sabotage invites the workers to part with it and pit brutality against brutality, intrigue against intrigue. Capitalist vice cannot be transformed into proletarian virtue, and centuries of progress have bequeathed something better to revolutionary workingmen than a vulgar and barren imitation of a bourgeois vice. The capitalist class welcomes the imitation, encourages it, even pays its hired tools to foster it in the unions. This class fostered it in the American Railway Union strike of 1894 for the purpose of breaking the strike.⁵ The liberal press today⁶ carries the story of how the employing classes at Lawrence, Massachusetts, planted dynamite in the recent strike to discredit the strikers, and one of the wealthy criminals lies a suicide after making a confession. The strikers declined to "raise general hell" and the exploiters decided to raise it for them. The Syndicalist, in the name of revolution, does that which the exploiter is anxious to pay for having done.

There is the further consideration that the methods known as sabotage are adapted to individual action, for which an entire group in a given struggle may be held responsible. It provides the conditions for the sneak and the spy to incriminate strikers and destroy the efficiency of mass action. As Chas. Dobbs admirably says:

"A resort to violence by individuals or a minority group as a means of settling a social problem is a confession of moral and intellectual incompetence.

"It is a confession that those who advocate or practice violence are afraid to submit the justice of their cause to the arbitration of reason.

"These propositions are, or ought to be, axiomatic. We may be impatient at the slow progress of our campaign to convert the majority to our point of view, but when this impatience finds expression in 'short cuts' to the New Jerusalem, it ceases to be scientific and becomes raw Utopianism. If this 'short cut' takes the form of brutal conflict or contemptible sabotage, it is a confession that education is a farce and that the only argument which men will recognize is a knife at the midriff or a blow between the eyes."⁷

The advocacy of sabotage is a natural consequence of the rejection of political action. Without sabotage and political action, all that is left is conservative unionism. An example of the "profound" reasoning employed for opposing political action may be seen by selecting a sample from the bulk. An active Syndicalist writes: "Politics being the dirtiest word in the English language, let us keep it that way, forestalling all attempts of politicians (Socialist or otherwise) to make it respectable in the eyes of the working class."⁸ Is there anything wanting in this

to convince a reasonable human being that the struggle of the working class for control of the governing powers is vile? It would be idle to attempt any reply. It carries with it the savagery of unreasoning bigotry that prompted the New England Puritans to pierce the tongues of Quakers for their "heresies."

Other Syndicalists have rational moments when considering political action, though it is not difficult to give numerous examples of the type of mind the above quotation discloses. Tom Mann, the foremost representative of Syndicalism in Great Britain, asserts that in many countries a proportion of Socialist representatives who were revolutionary, on being returned are no longer so after a few years in Parliament. "They are revolutionary," he writes, "neither in their attitude towards existing society nor in respect of present-day institutions. * * * Many seem to have constituted themselves apologists for existing society, showing a degree of studied respect for bourgeois conditions, and a toleration of bourgeois methods, that destroys the probability of their doing any real work of a revolutionary character."⁹

Socialists have recognized this tendency without drawing Syndicalist conclusions. This tendency comes up in one form or other at nearly every International Congress, which has always decided for a revolutionary attitude. In the different countries the party has also faced this tendency, and in France, the classic land of Syndicalism, the party has not hesitated to expel its Briands, Vivianis and Millerands. The Syndicalist throws up his hands in despair when a reformist tendency appears in the party, and straightway gives his entire time to the unions, many of which are officered by extreme conservatives, who openly oppose any revolutionary propaganda. England, no doubt, has its John Tobins and Harry Whites, who, from once being Socialists in their unions, have become not only conservatives but, like John Burns, enemies of the working class. Here in the unions will be found plenty of reasons for leaving them, as well as the party, and to insist that a proletarian revolution is a haunting vision of diseased minds. This attitude also ignores the real achievements that a measure of political power has made possible for the workers in many countries, especially in labor struggles. It is only a step from rejecting political action because a reformist tendency had developed within the party to rejecting it on principle and as being unnecessary. This latter attitude is the position that your true Syndicalist finally takes. When he has "arrived" there is no necessity for searching his literature for his reasons for opposing political action, as he has added nothing new to what the Anarchists have already said.

On the other hand, it is difficult to believe that Syndicalists can be sincere in their assertions that the Socialist Party stands for political action alone. The activities of the party are manifold. They include public demonstrations against hostile movements to subject the unions, to cripple them, or to jail their representatives; aid to the workers in big strikes through contributions and publicity; defense of Russian, Mexican and other political refugees and preserving the right of asylum for these in America; actual participation in every great class war of vital issue to the workers in this country,

and very often extending assistance to the workers of Europe in some of their great struggles, as, for example, the Russian revolution or the Swedish general strike. It may be said with truth that in every great struggle of vital importance in this country that did not involve the casting of ballots the Socialist Party has taken a leading part. In the Moyer-Haywood-Pettibone case, the struggle for the Mexican and Russian refugees, the strikes at McKees Rocks and Lawrence the party was the chief factor in directing public attention to these and securing assistance for the victims. Where else in capitalist society will one find an institution that has always been militant in behalf of every popular struggle? Even the unions have often had to be aroused by the party to some impending danger that threatened them. The party has never followed; it has always blazed the way for others in these struggles. The struggle in the mountain states that culminated in the Moyer-Haywood-Pettibone kidnaping had been given full publicity and support for many months by the party before the labor organizations were thoroughly aroused, and it required the kidnaping to awaken them to the serious aspect of the struggle. In view of all this the Syndicalist simply ignores many facts of recent history when asserting that the party is only interested in electoral struggles. Socialists are interested in every genuine working-class struggle, whether expressed in strikes, lockouts, free speech struggles, refugee cases or other phases of the class war.

Possessing little political power, the party is already making history. It has been a powerful factor in removing some particularly vile judges from the Federal bench. It is no exaggeration to also say that the rise of the Socialist Party has compelled the old parties to change their platforms. It has even been instrumental in calling into existence that sinister abortion, the Progressive party, as a political department of the United States Steel Corporation. It has compelled Roosevelt to insert some of the demands of the Socialist Party in the platform of the Progressive party, but we, as Socialists, know that if these demands are enacted into law they will be twisted and distorted into "jokers" that will give further security to the ruling classes. Still we have testimony to the power of the party when Roosevelt takes these demands. It only requires the triumph of him and his associates to prove that such demands when passed as bills become the reverse of these demands as conceived by Socialists. The Liberal Party of Great Britain has already given evidence of this. Its "popular" demands are not worth the paper that contains them, while it has even gone further in its use of armed forces to suppress strikes of workingmen.

It may also be said that the partial success of the Lawrence strike, which is pointed to by syndicalists as an example of modern union tactics, was largely due to the fact that a Socialist Congressman forced a genuine investigation of the strike. This gave publicity to police atrocities and the wretched conditions of the textile operatives. In spite of all the boasting of the men who became prominent as leaders of the strike, it is also a fact that they had to finally accept a compromise, and the most active man, who planned the struggle and who shared in its sacrifices, was finally blacklisted and forced to

seek employment elsewhere. The state and political power will force themselves on the attention of syndicalists, however much they may claim to reject them or to minimize them as factors in the class war.

III. French Syndicalism.

France is the home of Syndicalism, for here the doctrines and policies embraced by the word were formed. It developed out of conditions peculiar to the working class movement of France and may be stated as follows:

1. The recognition by the Anarchists that the "propaganda of the deed" had failed to stir the workers to revolt for the overthrow of church and state. Repeated assassinations and outrages had left the European workers suspicious and hostile toward Anarchism instead of giving them courage to resort to violence, as the Anarchists had hoped.

2. The apostacy of a number of prominent Socialists who had been elected to Parliament caused distrust among French workers for political action, which gave the Anarchists an opportunity for new activity which the failure of their old methods made necessary.

3. The trade unions, formerly regarded by Anarchists as largely a compromise with capitalism and conservative by nature, were now entered by them and union methods were glorified as the "economic revolution." The distrust of political action was encouraged and the mass strike and sabotage were held to be sufficient for the task of overthrowing capitalism. The dirk and the bomb were replaced by sabotage and the general strike. These are the historical conditions that gave rise to "insatiable Syndicalism."

The Anarchist propaganda of the deed had its beginnings in the late '70s, and by 1894 a reign of terror prevailed in France because of frequent attacks on public officials and bomb explosions in theaters, cafes and other public places. These received enthusiastic approval in the Anarchist press, even when innocent people were among the victims. It was about this time that Ravachol, a common murderer, appeared in Paris and became associated with the Anarchists. In 1886 Ravachol, desiring to possess the money of an old man, split his skull with a hatchet. In 1891 he unearthed a corpse with the intention of stripping it of its jewels, but his crime was barren of any material result. The same year he strangled an old hermit and shared his booty with his mistress. Later he turned up in Paris and professed Anarchist principles. It was not the first time that men of this type became attracted to Anarchism, and Ravachol soon became active in a number of bomb explosions, which finally led to his arrest and execution for the murders already mentioned. When sentence of death was pronounced he defiantly shouted "Vive l'Anarchie!"¹ The end of Ravachol, recalls Plechanoff's epigram that "it is difficult to tell where the 'companion' ends and the bandit begins." In recent years a series of crimes were committed by "auto bandits" in Paris, and these and their deeds were glorified in the Syndicalist press.

Coining counterfeit money and practicing "individual expropriation" (robbery) also constituted the "direct action" of the Anarchists who coined the phrase. In fact, direct action

never meant anything but individual action until the Anarchists entered the unions, when it came to include action by minority groups.² The Congress of Syndicates (unions) which met at Rennes in 1898 considered a report by M. Pouget, an Anarchist, which stated, among other things: "We can only lay down the theory and express the wish that the boycott and the sabotage should enter into the arsenal of weapons which the workingmen use in their struggle against capitalists on the same plane as the strike, and that, more and more, the direction of the social movement should be toward the direct action of individuals and towards a greater consciousness of their personal powers."³ Two years later in Paris another Congress affirmed that a daring revolutionary minority could accomplish a Social Revolution; that "everyone would take what he needs wherever he found it; the result would be the completest possible emancipation." One year later at Lyons another Congress declares the general strike will emancipate the workers "through the violent expropriation of the capitalist class."⁴ These are the views of the Anarchists after they abandoned the Ravachol kind of "direct action" and swallowed their ancient prejudices against the unions. Individual vandalism is not rejected, but is merely coupled with action by "militant minorities." This is "Insatiable Syndicalism," a "rebirth of Marxism," or the "New Socialism," according to Robert Rives LaMonte!⁵ Marx has certainly become very yellow and out of date.

The opportunity for securing acceptance of these destructive ideas came when Millerand, and later Briand and Viviani, accepted cabinet positions in a capitalist government. The Anarchists now in the unions pointed to the treachery of the renegade Socialists as the logical result of all political action. Why should workingmen bother themselves with a capitalist institution like Parliament? Here is the logical result of all political action, they answered. The working class go into politics and their deputies not only become politicians, but reactionary, and actually share in responsibility for repressive measures against workingmen.

There was absolutely nothing new in the argument that Socialists had not met before, yet it had its effect, so that the unions assumed an anti-political character and the fusion of Anarchism with unionism produced the peculiar thing known as Syndicalism. The genuine Marxists, like Jules Guesde and Paul Lafargue, were well aware of the origin and history of Syndicalism and opposed it. One of the most prominent theoretical exponents of Syndicalism, M. Sorel, finally renounced his "revolutionary" views and in 1910 wrote in answer to an invitation from Italian Syndicalists to attend their Congress that deeper questions "now interest the cultivated youth of France." One of the "deeper questions" that seemed to attract him was the restoration of monarchy; he made preparations for the publication of a neo-monarchist monthly which never saw the light. This act weakened the faction Sorel had affiliated with.⁶ Political action may have its dangers, yet it would seem that even Syndicalism can not avail against the "original sin" that sometimes lead men into traitorous conduct and to embrace reactionary views. It is certain that vile politics was not responsible for the apostacy of Sorel.

French Syndicalists, like the Socialists, carry on an active propaganda against militarism, and it may be admitted that they have accomplished some good on this score. A reaction against the non-political attitude of the workers is also taking place, which would indicate that Anarchist views are on the decline. Gustave Herve, one of the most admirable of the anti-militarists, and who had been very sympathetic with the Syndicalist propaganda, has recently admitted the mistake he and his associates have made.

In his paper, "*La Guerre Sociale*," Herve recently wrote: "We went on to crab the Socialist Party and by a pleasant process of generalization called it a hotbed of traitors and humbugs on the make. We did our best to wreck the faith of the working classes in the parliamentary system.

"Unfortunately, we have overshot the mark. We succeeded only too well. We meant to react against the extremes of parliamentary Socialism, and we drove many of our best men to the other extreme, a still more fatal one, viz., anti-parliamentarism, so today the great dangers for the Socialist Party are the ravages by abstaining from voting and by the anarchistic anti-parliamentarism in the general labor federation." ⁷ It is certain that this declaration by Herve and his associates will have a marked influence on the French Socialists who have been lured away from the political movement by the Anarcho-Syndicalists.

French Syndicalism is also intensely anti-patriotic as its anti-militarist propaganda would indicate. In his book, "*My Country, Right or Wrong*," Herve deals with this question at length and strongly advocates insurrection by the working class in case of war. At the International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart, 1907, Herve embodied his idea of how to meet the threat of war in a resolution which urged the military strike and insurrection. In the debate which followed he declared: "But you may depend upon it, if you march against France, you will be received with the shots of our insurrectional communes upon which you will see waving the red flag of our International, which you will have betrayed!" ⁸ It is evident that these insurrectional communes could only consist of a "militant minority" unless France had been conquered by the working class. In the latter case, to greet foreign workers with shot and shell would be a crime greater than that of workmen ignorantly fighting a war for their ruling class. If the workers are still a minority then the military revolt invites a wholesale massacre of the revolting minority at the hands of the military forces still at the command of French capitalism. The Congress declined to accept the resolution of Herve, though urging the workers to use "all their forces for utilizing the economical and political crisis created by war, in order to rouse the masses of the people, and to hasten the downfall of the predominance of the capitalist class."

The French Syndicalists apparently believe that they are soon to overthrow the capitalist state and its related institutions. The Congress of Lyons in 1901 proceeded to secure information from affiliated syndicates bearing on the question of how they were prepared to carry on production after the social revolution; what resources they had for this purpose and what suggestions they had to offer for carrying it out.

Among the questions asked were the following:

1. How would your syndicat act in order to transform itself from a group of combat into a group for production?
2. How would you act in order to take possession of the machinery pertaining to your industry?
3. How do you conceive the functions of the organized shops and factories in the future?
4. If your syndicat is a group within the system of highways, of transportation of products or of passengers, of distribution, etc., how do you conceive its functioning?
5. What will be your relations to your federation of trade or of industry after your reorganization?
6. On what principle would the distribution of products take place and how would the productive groups procure the raw materials for themselves?

"Insatiable Syndicalism," like the Utopianism of the past, is anxious to plan the details of a new society. The unions being regarded as the economic framework of a new society, the questions were naturally addressed to them.

The French theorists of Syndicalism are divided by Levine into two groups, one of active workers in the Syndicalist movement and the other of "intellectuals" outside. The former have emphasized and worked out the methods of Syndicalism while the latter have worked out its theoretical basis. The most "profound" thinker of this group is Sorel, who as already stated, has gone over to the party seeking a restoration of the monarchy.

Sorel's claim to originality is that he has followed the Marxian method and has modernized the revolutionary principles of Marx. He is true to the spirit of Marx, but rescues the latter from the false interpretations of his views. Besides, Sorel holds, Marx could not penetrate the future and anticipate present tendencies so that it devolves on Sorel, while following the Marxian method, to take up this neglected work. In common with Marxists Sorel will have no toleration of Utopian speculation. The economic forces of society must develop to maturity before the social revolution is possible, and the working class must be equipped morally and intellectually to direct the power that will come into its hands. This training and discipline can only be acquired in the unions for these develop the administrative and organizing capacities of the workers while politics only develops political dictatorship.

The most potent educating and organizing force, according to Sorel, is the general strike which finally means the social revolution. The idea is a "social myth" which gives it great force. The "social myth" plays an important part in Sorel's "neo-Marxism." Men in a great cause see themselves as images battling in future struggles and these images are "myths." These images can not be analyzed like a tangible thing yet the "social myth" is ever present in every great social struggle. The reader may think that Sorel is soaring in mysticism or drifting on a Utopian tide at this point, but we have his assurance that "myths" are essential to a revolutionary movement and we will have to be satisfied with this "Marxian method." Perhaps M. Sorel in following the "social myth" found it later in his monarchist propaganda.

He holds that violence stimulates the class feelings of the workers and will finally intimidate the exploiting capitalists into giving all their attention to the development of their economic interests and so hasten the complete development of capitalism. Marx was anything but mystical yet Sorel deliberately plunges into the depths of his consciousness and brings forth the "social myth" as a contribution to economic and social science. Claiming to follow the Marxian method, he deserts it by affirming that science cannot explain anything, while Marx affirmed that it was possible to forecast at least the outlines of the future if we comprehend the tendencies of the present. Marx is the realist; Sorel is the mystic. As Levine puts it, Sorel "attributes a large role to the unclear, to the subconscious and to the mystical in all social phenomena." An example of Sorel's thought may be had from the following:

"Socialism is necessarily a very obscure thing, because it treats of production—that is, of what is most mysterious in human activity—and because it proposes to realize a radical transformation in this region which it is impossible to describe with the clearness which is found in the superficial regions of the world. No effort of thought, no progress of knowledge, no reasonable induction will ever be able to dispel the mystery which envelops Socialism."

Here we find it affirmed that the superficial can be analyzed and described with clearness while the facts and reality of capitalist production must ever remain a mystery! Wages and profits are beyond the human mind but "social myths" are easily comprehended as well as "superficial regions of the world." We commend this passage to those sympathetic with the "rebirth of Marxism" or the "New Socialism" of our American Syndicalists.¹⁰ It is hardly necessary to contrast this peculiar blending of mystical and abstract thinking with the realism of all the modern Socialist writers including Marx. If there is any relation between the former and the latter it is a relation of antagonism at every point. Yet we are urged in the name of the working class and its future to abandon the modern scientific method and theory of Socialism for this shallow, mystical speculation of "revolutionary Syndicalism!"

A number of other factors have played their part in shaping the Syndicalist movement in France. A country of small-scale production and small capitalists like France has not the economic basis for a large union movement. Contrary to the opinion of many American Syndicalists industrial unionism is not synonymous with Syndicalism. The two have no necessary relation. It is doubtful whether there is one genuine industrial union in France, although the federated unions act with more unity than the craft unions of many countries. The genuine Syndicalists in America recognize this fact, as will be shown later, and lay less emphasis on industrial organization. They are more interested in methods than in form of organization.

The revolutionary traditions of France have had a marked influence on all political and economic theories and no man can hope to get a hearing, or at least a following, unless he presents his theories in some startling or revolutionary way. Impulsive and idealistic as the people are everything must be reduced to a scientific formula and be justified before the bar of their revolutionary traditions. Craft unionism, with this

historical background and guided by its Anarchist patrons, thus became a "revolutionary" craft unionism, or Syndicalism. Even bourgeois politicians like Clemenceau have in their public addresses exhibited a daring in the use of revolutionary language that sometimes startled their immediate followers.

The small membership of the unions and the reluctance of the members to pay high dues are also sources of weakness which made the resort to sabotage and violence easily acceptable, especially when these methods were outlined and defended by the adroit arguments ever at the command of the Anarchists. The poverty of the unions has induced them to consider co-operative associations to aid them when their members are on strike. For this reason, also, as Levine points out, "Syndicats on strike, impelled by the desire to increase their forces, try to involve as many trades and workingmen as possible and to enhance their own chances by enlarging the field of struggle. This is why such general movements, as the movement for an eight-hour day, * * * * are advocated by the syndicates. The latter feel that in order to gain any important demand they must be backed by as large a number of workingmen as possible. But in view of their weakness, the syndicates can start a large movement only by stirring up the country, by formulating some general demand which on the one hand appeals to all workingmen, while on the other hand it throws employers into consternation. The same conditions explain in part the favor which the idea of the general strike has found in the syndicates." 11

It is not contended that the Anarchists alone are responsible for Syndicalism. In the Syndicalist movement of France may be found many active Socialists, some accepting and some opposing the Anarchist theories. There are others who are neither Anarchists or Socialists, but unionists, "pure and simple." Yet it remains a fact that the Anarchists have had the largest share in formulating the theoretical basis of Syndicalism, and the latter is in many respects harmonious with Anarchism in general.

IV. Syndicalism in America.

It is not very difficult to trace the development of Syndicalist views in America, although they are not as clearly defined as in France. The first utterance giving expression to some phase of Syndicalist thought is contained in the speech of Daniel De Leon, of the Socialist Labor Party, in Minneapolis, on July 10, 1905. The Industrial Workers of the World had just been organized at Chicago, and De Leon proceeded to give his own interpretation of its mission and principles. De Leon had long had access to the French Socialist and Syndicalist publications, and in this speech he proclaims it the mission of the union to "take and hold" the machinery of production. He further emphasizes this by asserting that "it is not a political organization * * * * that can 'take and hold' the land and the capital and the fullness thereof." Only an economic organization can do this and this constitutes the "code of action," the "code of Marxian tactics." The end of the political movement is destructive; the moment we capture the powers of the State—"the robber burg of capitalism"—we do nothing

but adjourn! To hold this power any longer than it takes us to abandon it would be usurpation. In taking the State we do so only to "abolish" it. The headquarters of the I. W. W. then becomes the capital of the nation. If the capitalist class resist the seizure of industry by the union—well, so much the worse for them, for the I. W. W. "will be in position to mop the earth with the rebellious usurper."¹

Three Syndicalist ideas are here more or less clearly expressed, namely, seizure of the machinery of production by the union; immediate abolition of the State, and, though not rejecting political action, using it to obtain power and then giving it up after being attained. De Leon recognizes the possibility of capitalist resistance to union seizure, and this at least would suggest the wisdom of holding the State and using its powers to suppress the usurper, but he will have none of this. The politically victorious workers must "adjourn," and if the capitalists resist the I. W. W. will in some way—we are not told how—"mop the earth with them." Perhaps the I. W. W. will "raise general hell," as another Syndicalist expresses it. At least there is no other conjecture left to us. Political action is not completely rejected, but to abandon political power after winning it differs little from refusing to struggle for it in the first place. De Leon's grudging concession to politics at all was necessary, or the S. L. P. would also have to "adjourn."

To "abolish" the State is also an idea common to Anarchists and Syndicalists. Engels shows that by no means will the State be "abolished" when it is conquered by the workers, nor will our first and last act on assuming power be to adjourn. **"The proletariat seizes political power and turns the means of production into State property,"** he writes. He further asserts that in doing this the State is abolished as a State, i. e., as an organ of a ruling class. It is not abandoned, but its class character disappears and this comes by a gradual process; its "interference in social relations becomes, in one domain after another, superfluous, and then dies out of itself * * * * The State is not 'abolished.' It dies out." He then refers to the "demands of the so-called Anarchists for the abolition of the State out of hand."² In fact, the state, like the school and the press, will simply lose its class character and with the abolition of classes will be transformed into a popular agency for serving the common needs of society.

The ideas embodied in De Leon's speech and later in his paper were repeated by his partisans and accepted by some members in the Socialist Party. Scarcely anything was known of Syndicalism in America at this time and the word itself had not appeared in our publications. A short time before De Leon delivered his Minneapolis speech he delivered another at Newark, N. J. Here he spoke of the necessity of industrial organization to "save the eventual and possible political victory from bankruptcy, by enabling the working class to assume and conduct production the moment the guns of the public powers fall into its hands—or before, if need be, if capitalist political chicanery pollutes the ballot box."³ Here the ideas are expressed of the union seizing industry before a political victory—"if need be"—or under the protection of the guns which political power will give us. At Minneapolis, however, we are to abandon the guns

as soon as they fall into our hands by "adjourning" and, if it is necessary, the I. W. W. will "mop the earth" with the rebellious capitalist even without guns, i. e., the force which control of the governing power gives. There is no more certainty in the phrase "mop the earth" than there is in that of Labille's, who urges the workers to "raise general hell." Both are suggestive of some form of violence, yet blissfully vague as to whether the general strike or armed insurrection or some other method is advised to meet the crisis. The shamefaced Syndicalist is no more definite at this point than the pure variety.

After the Minneapolis speech of De Leon the conception of the industrial union as the agency through which industry would not only be seized by the workers, but also serve as the "structure of the new society within the shell of the old," became more pronounced. One faction of the I. W. W. drifted to the position of rejecting political action entirely and advised the workers to "strike at the ballot box—with an ax!" This faction at least dispensed with the folly of urging the conquest of political power, only to abandon it when conquered.

Later the Utopianism of the French Syndicalists, who anticipated the social revolution by sending out a series of questions to learn how the workers would manage the particular industries each union would seize, was matched by a pamphlet, issued by William E. Trautmann, containing a chart with a complete outline of the organization of all industries.⁴ The Frenchmen at least had the merit of moving cautiously and getting information from the workers as to their ideas and wishes before reducing the New Jerusalem to a diagram.

One of the largest monthlies soon became affected with the new propaganda, first by printing articles from contributors of a Syndicalist trend, and later by editorially endorsing Syndicalism. A. M. Stirton wrote in January, 1910, that "it is quite impossible to convince him (the worker) that the mere putting of pieces of paper in a ballot box will solve problems which he finds ourselves side-stepping in our literature and party platforms." He goes on to state that when "the workers are once industrially organized so that they are competent to control production and distribution, in that very moment they have possession. They need no further process, either with gun, ballot or bargain. They are practically in possession." Here no resistance to union seizure is expected, for neither "gun, ballot or bargain" are required if the workers will simply "take and hold" the industries. Later in the same article the possibility of capitalists resistance occurs to him, and he suggests the "convenience" of the workers having a political party in power, but merely to "ratify the acts of the revolutionary proletariat."⁵ Putting "pieces of paper in a ballot box" might after all be of some service to the workers, slight though it be. Tom Mann is quoted by William D. Haywood, with approval, in a later issue of the same publication that "with or without Parliamentary action, industrial solidarity will insure economic freedom."⁶

In a pamphlet Haywood and Bohn join in a restatement of their attitude toward unionism and Socialism, which bears the impress of Syndicalist ideas. Speaking of the State, they assert that "The Socialist Party can seize it, prevent its doing

further harm to the workers and at the proper time throw it on the scrap heap. * * * The Syndicalist idea of "abolishing" the State is here rather vaguely expressed. Their conception of its use before being thrown on the "scrap heap" is to prevent it doing any harm to the workers who are taking possession of industry. As Sorel, the French Syndicalist, regarded Socialism as a deep "mystery," so Haywood and Bohn regard the political phase of Socialism, "by the passing of laws in the legislatures and Congress," as so many questions that are "naturally many and hard." Everything becomes simple, however, when looking at Socialism through "shop windows." Why the first is hard and the second not is left to the conjecture of the reader. It is our opinion that the assertion is merely a gentle form of sabotage against political action, with which all this literature abounds. In fact, they become more positive in this sabotage against political action by proclaiming old-age pensions "charity doled out to paupers, or bribes given to voters by politicians." However, suspicion is set at rest when they come to consider the government of cities, where fire departments, waterworks, public schools and health departments are not regarded as so much "charity doled out to paupers," but as "social service departments" that must be extended under working class control. Just why health departments are not classed with pensions as charity for paupers we are unable to say. The same pamphlet contains the statement that provoked so much controversy last year, to the effect that the worker "will use any weapon which will win his fight."

Everywhere in this literature is to be found ambiguous statements, adroit evasions, suggestive passages, guarded attacks and contradictions. It is difficult to find any two that agree regarding political action, what part it is to play in the class struggle and the role ascribed to it when the working class is triumphant. All of them, however, emphasize the supreme importance of the union, and if political action is not rejected it is accepted only as a weak aid, at least, to the union. All of them regard the industrial union as the agency that will take possession of industry, and this final act will be reached by a series of strikes leading up to it, during which the party is to be a collecting agency to secure funds for the strikers. In a personal interview with Haywood in New York on June 4, 1912, the Scripps-McRae paper report him as saying:

"Syndicalism is the creed of the direct attack by one big union, composed of all the workers of the world. When we are all ready, when we have our world-union near enough to completion, we will simply lay down our tools—all of us. And if we are strong enough to lay down our tools in a body, we will be strong enough to pick up our tools—and at our own terms. Our terms will be an utter rejection of any bargain except that we receive all that we earn."

Throughout the interview there is no mention of political action or of the Socialist Party. The social revolution is to be accomplished by "one big union," and we are assured that no violence will accompany the world strike, but that, on the contrary, the change will be effected in a peaceful manner. It would seem that Haywood's terrible experience with the po-

litical and military powers of the Rocky Mountain States in the strike a few years ago has taught him nothing. If the working class is not to learn lessons from the reality of the class struggle, all theorizing about a peaceful world-strike is on a par with the Frenchman's "social myth"—it is a Utopian phantom of the brain. Capitalist ownership and control of the great plants of production and means of distribution is secured by its command of force which centers in the State. Experience teaches that even a strike, when prolonged any length of time, stirs the agents of governing power, the judges, executives, police and militia which are directed against the strikers. To assert that the control of the powers that direct these agents of class rule is of no consequence to the working class is to ignore the sinister part these agents have played in class struggles and to abandon the lessons that history and experience teach. It is advice as treacherous in its consequences as the advice of reactionary labor leaders who would lead trusting workers to support capitalist parties, who, in turn, have used these capitalist agents against strikers.

We have seen in a previous chapter that common bandits have been glorified by the French Syndicalists. It would seem hardly necessary to argue that the Socialist movement has no room for the burglar or the bandit, and that a general approval of their acts would be to encourage a general campaign of individual crime that would shatter class solidarity and render the practitioners the victims of police hunts. Yet Haywood wrote from Paris, in March, 1911, quoting Herve's editorial extolling the deeds of a pickpocket, who, after serving his sentence, armed himself with a revolver and knife and murdered one of the policemen who had arrested him. Individual vengeance is praised to the skies in the editorial, and all in the name of a movement that seeks a world transformation that will make both police brutality and private vengeance merely records of a barbaric past.⁸ This, by the way, is hardly in accord with the Scripps-McRae interview, in which the forecast of a world-strike is sketched along peaceful lines.

The conquest of the State by a working class party is nominally accepted by some of our shamefaced Syndicalists, with the understanding that such nominal endorsement will bring sympathy and aid to them in the strikes they would encourage. The Socialist Party, having a large membership and a mass of sympathizers, is capable of securing large sums for workingmen engaged in strikes, and this is not to be overlooked, but the party must accept a secondary and minor role in the forces that make for revolution. The following, from a semi-Syndicalist organ, is an indication of this attitude:

"Direct action is now and always will be the most effective weapon that the worker can use in the class war. Political action should never be considered as anything more than an adjunct to direct action. The political party of the working class should never be looked upon as being more than an auxiliary force to the industrial union of the working class. * * * If we lose every city and town we have 'captured' we should be not one bit less hopeful, so long as the workers continue to organize in One Big Union."⁹

Shall we be "one bit less hopeful," on the other hand, should

the industrial union lose strike after strike? Or is it contended that the industrial union cannot suffer defeat the same as the party of the working class? The assumption is that the industrial union is invincible, as it is proposed to win more and more through strikes until the capitalist class is so weakened that a final general strike will force it to yield the remaining measure of power it possesses. Neither experience nor history are drawn on to support this claim. In this country it is a bare assumption and in France only the phantom of the "social myth" is advanced to sustain it. One Big Union has become a fetish, and so absorbed in it have some of its partisans become that they forget the world of capitalist power lodged in the press, pulpit, newspapers, police, militia and army, all of which they must face when at war with the capitalist class, even for some minor concession.

On the other hand, while the Syndicalists insist on the party coming to the aid of strikes, they have been very careful in the constitution of the I. W. W. to oppose any sympathetic relations with the party; to prohibit the use of funds for political purposes; to deny its organizers the right to speak for the party or any of its officers to accept nominations from the party. Three clauses outline this attitude, as follows:

"Art. VI, Sec. 7. No funds of the General Administration of the I. W. W. or subordinate parts thereof shall be used for political party purposes.

"Art. VII, Sec. 12. No organizer of the I. W. W. while on the platform for this organization shall advocate any political party or political party platform.

"Art. IX, Sec. 3. No general officer of the organization or parts thereof, or any salaried organizer, shall be permitted to accept any office in any political organization, nor shall they be allowed to accept any nomination for any political office except permission be granted by a referendum vote of the entire organization."

It is a peculiar kind of reciprocity which demands aid and support from an organization and then refuses to grant it in return. In its effect there is little difference between this attitude and the hostile attitude of the reactionary leaders of the American Federation of Labor. Here again we find the ultra-revolutionist in practical agreement with reactionary opponents of Socialism. In their effort to become more revolutionary than the revolutionist they complete the circle and find themselves companions-in-arms with the enemy.

The attitude of our shamefaced Syndicalists toward violence is suggestive of the Jesuit. The genuine Syndicalist is at least frank regarding this, as we have seen in extracts from their organ, "The Toiler." The national convention of the Socialist Party, in 1912, inserted a clause in the National Constitution which reads as follows:

"Any member of the party who opposes political action or advocates sabotage or other methods of violence as a weapon of the working class to aid in its emancipation shall be expelled from membership in the party. Political action shall be construed to mean participation in elections for public office and practical legislative and administrative work along the lines of the Socialist Party platform."

This clause provoked the most heated debate in the convention and was opposed by the sympathizers with Syndicalism on the ground that the party had never advocated violence and to adopt this clause was to confess that we had. The debate ranged about this question, but the opponents of the clause had forgotten that the National Convention four years before had adopted a resolution advising the working class to abstain from violence, which was adopted without debate and with only one dissenting vote. The resolution was reported by the Committee on Resolutions, and reads as follows:

"The present industrial depression has reduced a large number of men and women to acute distress through lack of employment, and many of these, not knowing how to express their indignation and revolt, are easily led by detectives, police and other agents of the capitalist class into acts of violence.

"We hold that any such acts of violence on the part of the working people not only result in injuring their cause, but in helping the ruling class to maintain its power.

"We urge, therefore, all who desire the triumph of the working class to refrain from violence and from words inciting to violence, and to put all their energy into the economic fight waged by the unions, and the political fight waged by the Socialist Party." 10

Only the dissenting vote of Delegate Slobodin, of New York, prevented the adoption of this resolution by a unanimous vote. Not one of those who professed a fear that the adoption of a clause four years later similar to this resolution would be an admission that we had favored violence in the past, urged this objection in 1908. Neither was any referendum demanded on this resolution. The tendency toward violence had not manifested itself in the national councils of the party at that time, so that the resolution was applauded and adopted without debate.

The clause adopted by the Convention of 1912 contains the word "sabotage." It was also contended by the Syndicalist sympathizers in the convention that there were special objections to the insertion of this word. They, however, offered a substitute for this clause which would not only strike out the objectionable word, but everything referring to violence. The clause adopted by the convention was afterward endorsed by the membership. In an analysis of the vote in the convention, W. J. Ghent has shown that between 67 and 75 per cent of the delegates who voted against the clause were not proletarians, though they professed to represent the revolutionary proletariat. 11

However, the defeat of the Syndicalists leaves them as active as ever. Robert Rives La Monte in a recent article writes of the "almost miraculous powers" of Syndicalism. He quotes the resolution on labor organizations of 1912, which affirms the necessity of organizing the unorganized, abolishing artificial restrictions on membership, closer industrial and political union and joint attack of both on capitalism, and then draws the remarkable conclusion that "the Socialist Party now stands officially committed to the aggressive, revolutionary tactics of insatiable Syndicalism." 12 This in face of the fact that no phase of Syndicalism is endorsed in the labor resolution and the further fact that when the issue was clearly be-

fore the convention and the membership, in Section 6 of Article 2 of the Constitution, both rejected Syndicalism by decisive majorities! In this same article La Monte advises political action, but one month later he devotes eleven pages to show, among other things, that he who rejects political action is still a Socialist if he believes the union will overthrow the capitalist class. Indeed, he outlines a "New Socialism" and affirms that "The only Socialism that now inspires hopes and fears is of the school of Tom Mann and William D. Haywood." He is unable to find that Marx ever believed that parliamentary politics would play any part in dispossessing the capitalist class. We, therefore, naturally wonder why Marx did not advise against the German working class, for example, organizing politically to secure control of the Reichstag. But later on, in the same article, La Monte makes the contradictory admission that "there can be but little doubt that Marx and his allies were right in holding that at that stage (the early period of modern Socialism) of industrial and historical development a powerful movement could only be built up along political lines."¹³ Marx did and he didn't believe in parliamentary politics! We confess that this is beyond our comprehension. Perhaps "Marx and his allies" would today be classed among the "yellows" who find themselves unable to follow the logic embodied in the "New Socialism" and the writings of the new revisionists.

La Monte's article represents the latest attempt to square Syndicalism with Socialism. Where the genuine Syndicalist is frank in his opposition to political action all the others, while nominally accepting it, do so in varying degrees. De Leon favors it, only to surrender the powers its exercise may bring to the workers. Haywood and Bohn in their pamphlet think it well to engage in political action to keep the army and police off the union while it is taking over industry and then throw the state over into the "scrap heap." St. John and his colleagues urge us to "strike at the ballot box with an ax." Stirton only has sarcasm to offer to those who "put pieces of paper into the ballot box," but on reflection thinks that it might be well to "ratify," by control of the state, the union seizure of industry. The Bridgeport variety thinks that to lose every political victory is of no consequence, so long as "one big union" thrives. William English Walling and the International Socialist Review favor political action, but contend that the immediate measures favored by Socialists will benefit the capitalist class more than the working class. This is the first instance we know of where "revolutionary" Socialists supported measures which they contend will advance capitalist interests more than they will proletarian interests. The impossibilist position is more honest. Finally, La Monte contends that it makes little difference whether the professed Socialist accepts political action or not, so long as he says he is a Socialist and affirms that he stands for the social revolution.

With this general summary we leave the reader to straighten out the tangle of conflicting views and cross purposes and piece out of them some definite policy—if he can.

V. Conclusion.

The views of a number of prominent Socialists may be here briefly considered in closing this booklet. It is asserted by La Monte¹ that, contrary to general opinion, Syndicalists do not favor violence, but that Socialists of the type of Morris Hillquit and Victor L. Berger do. The basis of this assertion is an article a few years ago by Berger advising armed rebellion if the workers after achieving a political victory are cheated by capitalist trickery. Hillquit, referring to the same possibility, stated that we would "fight like tigers." It is not difficult to perceive the sophistry of La Monte and the International Socialist Review in ascribing to these utterances an endorsement of violence in general and under normal conditions. Both Berger and Hillquit have reference to a possible contingency where peaceful methods are no longer possible and when to submit would be cowardice. In fact, there is nothing in their utterances that is in conflict with the recognized views of Socialists throughout the world. To affect a contrary belief is to admit a degree of ignorance that does little credit to its partisans. Even one who merely believes in a republic and popular suffrage may be in hearty agreement with the statements of Hillquit and Berger. Many non-Socialists would join with Socialists in armed resistance to any attempts to install "a man on horseback," for example. But there is a vast difference between this position and those who favor violence, or methods that invite it, under the normal development of capitalism.

"We are neither men of legality at any price, nor are we revolutionists at any price," writes Kautsky. In Chapter V. of one of his most brilliant books² Kautsky has a masterly discussion of this whole question of violence. "The Socialist Party is a revolutionary party, but not a revolution-making party," he writes. "The statesmen of the ruling class desire above everything else the commission of some insane act that would arouse, not only the ruling class itself, but the whole great indifferent mass of the population against the Socialists, and they desire this before the Socialists shall have become too powerful to be defeated. * * *

"When we declare that revolutions cannot be made, and when we maintain that it is foolish, and indeed pernicious, to incite to revolution, and when we act in accordance with these statements we do not do this in the interest of the capitalist politicians, but of the fighting proletariat. The interest of the proletariat today more than ever before demands that everything should be avoided that would tend to provoke the ruling class to a purposeless policy of violence. The Socialist Party governs itself in accord with this position.

"There is, however, a faction that calls itself proletarian and social revolutionary which takes as its most favored task, next to fighting the Socialist Party, the provoking of a policy of violence. The very thing that the statesmen of the ruling class desire, and which is alone capable of checking the victorious progress of the proletariat, is made the principle business of this faction. * * * The adherents of this faction do not seek to weaken but to enrage the capitalist.

"In France a portion of our party membership became

temporarily a government party. The masses received the impression that the Socialists had renounced their revolutionary principles. They lost faith in the party. Not a small section of them fell under the influence of the latest variety of Anarchism—Syndicalism—which, like the old Anarchism, follows the propaganda of the deed not so much to strengthen the proletariat as unnecessarily to frighten the bourgeoisie, to arouse its rage and provoke immature, inopportune tests of strength, to which the proletariat is not adequate in the existing conditions.

"It is just the revolutionary Marxists among French Socialists who have presented the most determined opposition to this tendency. They fight Syndicalism as energetically as ministerialism, and consider one just as injurious as the other."³

Kautsky further points out in a recent article that the French Syndicalists have not achieved any remarkable victories to boast of; that while in 1908 the percentage of victorious strikes was 17.14 per cent, at the same time the ratio of defeats rose from 37.8 to 52.56. He also quotes Hubert Lagardelle, one of the prominent Syndicalists, in 1911, as admitting that "the present crisis compels a general revision of the facts and the idea of Syndicalism. After a glorious beginning we find ourselves faced with that which is generally the result of forced marches—complete exhaustion."⁴

Perhaps the most prominent and best loved of all American Socialists is Eugene V. Debs. Though one of the strongest advocates of industrial unionism, he has refused to accept the Syndicalist interpretation given to the movement for it. "As a revolutionist," he writes, "I can have no respect for capitalist property laws nor the least scruple about violating them. If I had the least force to overthrow these despotic laws I would use it without an instant's hesitation, or delay, but I haven't got it, so I am law-abiding under protest—not from scruple—and bide my time. Here let me say that for the same reason I am opposed to 'sabotage' and 'direct action.' I have not a bit of use for the propaganda of the deed. These are the tactics of Anarchist individualists and not of Socialist collectivists. If I regarded the class struggle as guerilla warfare, I would join the Anarchists and practice as well as preach such tactics. If sabotage and direct action, as I interpret them, were incorporated in the tactics of the Socialist Party, it would at once be the signal for all the agents provocateurs and police spies to join the party and get busy."⁵

The Western Federation of Miners, one of the powerful organizations that made the organization of the I. W. W. possible, withdrew from it because of the Syndicalist views expressed by many of its active supporters. The official organ of the Federation has repeatedly attacked these views. "Hunger, strikes and sabotage," reads one editorial, "are not weapons of intelligent men in the labor movement.

"We are unalterably opposed to their tactics and methods.
* * * * Industrial unionism will not come through soup houses, spectacular free speech fights, sabotage or insults to the flags of nations, but will come through the logic and argument that appeal to the intelligence of the working class.

"Men will not be organized or educated by means of vio-

lence, for violence is but the weapon of ignorance, blind to the cause that subjugates humanity and sightless to the remedy that will break the fetters of wage slavery."⁶

The attitude of the Federation is significant, in view of the terrible struggles its members have endured and their experience with the brutal powers of the Rocky Mountain States. The criticisms directed by the Miners' Magazine against various phases of Syndicalism are usually very bitter and uncompromising.

It is also interesting to note that John Ohsol, a delegate to the National Convention of the Socialist Party from Massachusetts, voted in favor of Section 6 of Article 2, condemning sabotage. Ohsol is a Russian revolutionist and braved all the terrors of the Czar's regime, being elected to the second Duma. He was forced to flee, like so many of Russia's noblest youth, to escape the Czar's hangmen. Russia of all countries is fertile soil for the development of intrigue and violence in the working class movement, and it is probable that only armed insurrection will avail to overthrow the criminal regime. Yet even here, where most any form of violence has its justification, the revolutionary movement was shocked to learn that Father Gapon deliberately delivered the workers on Bloody Sunday to the Russian butchers. Still later it was found that Azeff, one of the most trusted of the revolutionary members of the Executive Committee, had betrayed many comrades to the hangmen. Nothing but secrecy and force are open to Russian Revolutionists, as the Duma and the Czar's word are practically worthless, yet even here these tactics have been adopted at a terrible cost to the revolutionary movement. The application of the word "yellow" to men of the type of Ohsol, who have been tried in fire and blood, can only be characterized as crass impudence, to use no harsher term.

In his report to the membership of Massachusetts, Ohsol wrote: "The Socialist Party has the control over acts of its members not only within the party, but also when these members are active within their labor organizations. One cannot afford to be a Socialist on a party platform and advocate sabotage from a labor organization platform. Those who want a 'free hand' should leave the Socialist Party at once.

"Crimes and violence are not to be confused with revolution. While the Socialists stand for revolution, they are opposed to individual acts of violence, which are nothing but manifestations of weakness and despair."⁷

Sabotage, or "striking on the job" by checking the processes of production or spoiling products, has one fatal weakness we have only hinted at in a preceding chapter. In many industries the capitalist class can arrange conditions of employment so that the practice of sabotage will automatically reduce the wages of the saboteurs in the same ratio as products are damaged. In fact, the introduction of "scientific management" by many capitalist firms is a tendency in this direction. Instead of maintaining time wages the employers can substitute piece wages, making the wage dependent on the quantity and quality of the articles produced, so that any damage they may sustain by the practice of sabotage will react on the saboteurs by reducing their wages.

It may even be encouraged by the capitalists for the purpose of fomenting antagonism and bitterness between workers in a given industry by goading the workers in one department, working for low time wages, to produce damaged material for workers in another department who receive piece or tonnage wages. The latter must naturally suffer from the saboteurs in another department, as their wages are dependent on the good material received from the saboteurs. It is just this antagonism within the workshop that the Socialist movement has every reason to break down and the capitalist class to encourage. The solidarity of class interests necessary to overthrow the capitalist regime cannot be realized so long as the exploiters can make proletarians work at cross purposes. A general indulgence in sabotage would soon teach shrewd capitalists how to make it react against the workers, and all the employing capitalists would soon follow the example of their more far-sighted fellow exploiters.

Much of the Syndicalist literature views the world only through "shop windows." Outside the shop there are no problems and the capture of the shop solves all questions. Many do not perceive that the State and its subdivisions, the county, city, ward and township, embrace many services and functions that are absolutely essential to modern civilization. Public roads, hospitals, schools, sewage, health departments, parks, libraries, etc., are all a part of the social life of our time and, with the leisure that will come to an emancipated working class, many of these services and functions will have a larger expansion than under capitalism. They are all bound up with various divisions of the state and do not come under shop control and management. Yet these and related questions receive no consideration from many Syndicalist writers. Their "shop" view of the world is a vulgarized conception of the working class and its needs that differs little from the bourgeois view that Lafargue has so wittily satirized in his "Right to Be Lazy." The "shop" philosophy is not the collectivist philosophy of modern Socialism, but falls far short of it.

Capitalist society has generated a complex civilization that contains more than can be comprehended through "shop windows." It has also recruited its "grave diggers" in the modern proletarians, but they are not vulgarized proletarians. They are workers who are conscious of the class rule that holds them in servitude and they are determined to overthrow it. They recognize with Lassalle that this class "in whose heart therefore no germ of a new privilege is contained, is for this very reason synonymous with the whole human race. Its interest is in truth the interest of the whole of humanity, its freedom is the freedom of humanity itself, and its domination is the domination of all."

REFERENCES

I. HISTORICAL

¹Unfortunately little of the Bernstein reformist literature is accessible to English readers. Aside from a few articles published by Victor L. Berger in the Social Democratic Herald a few years ago scarcely anything has appeared in English in defense of Bernstein's views. In 1909 one small volume, written by Bernstein in defense of his views, entitled "Evolutionary Socialism: A Criticism and Affirmation," was published by B. W. Huebsch of New York.

²International Socialist Review, June, 1912.

³Robert Rives La Monte in "The International Socialist Review," August, 1912.

⁴N. I. Stone, "Attitude of the Socialists Toward the Trade Unions"; Hillquit, "History of Socialism in the United States," Revised and Enlarged Edition, Chap. III; Hughan, "American Socialism of the Present Day," Chap. III.

⁵Stone, "Attitude of the Socialists Toward the Trade Unions," p. 6.

⁶Kautsky, "The Class Struggle (Erfurt Program)," p. 182.

⁷National Convention Proceedings, 1904, p. 182.

II. PRINCIPLES OF SYNDICALISM

¹Walling, "Labor-Union Socialism and Socialist Labor-Unionism," pp. 77-78.

²The Syndicalist, London, March-April, 1912.

³J. A. Labille in "The Toller, A Militant Advocate of Industrialism," April, 1912. This is the first Syndicalist publication to appear in the United States. It is a representative of the movement as it is known in Europe.

⁴Baginski in "The Toller," July, 1912.

⁵Report on the Chicago Strike, 1894, United States Strike Commission. This volume is filled with evidence of capitalist encouragement of sabotage and crime.

⁶August 28, 1912.

⁷Chas. Dobbs in "The Masses," July, 1912.

⁸Fred G. Moore, in "The Toller," June, 1912.

⁹Quoted by Walling, "Socialism As It Is," p. 371.

III. FRENCH SYNDICALISM

¹Vizetelly, "The Anarchists," Chap. VI.

²Louis Goaziou, a French comrade and delegate to the National Convention of 1912, has an excellent article on this in the "Daily Socialist," of Chicago, July 18, 1912.

³Levine, "The Labor Movement in France: A Study in Revolutionary Syndicalism," p. 95.

⁴Ibid, pp. 97, 103.

⁵La Monte, in International Socialist Review, September, 1912.

⁶Levine, "The Labor Movement in France," pp. 151-152.

⁷Cable dispatch, August 18, 1912.

⁸Herve, "My Country," Appendix.

⁹Levine, "The Labor Movement in France," p. 128.

¹⁰I have drawn on Chapter VI of Levine's "The Labor Movement in France" for this summary of the views of Sorel. This work received a favorable review in the "International Socialist Review" of Chicago. The work is, in fact, an impartial historical study of the rise of Syndicalism in France.

¹¹Levine, "The Labor Movement in France," pp. 197-198.

IV. SYNDICALISM IN AMERICA

¹See "The Preamble of the Industrial Workers of the World," address delivered by Daniel De Leon, July 10, 1905.

²Engels, "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," Part III.

³De Leon, "The Burning Question of Trades Unionism."

⁴Trautmann, "One Big Union."

⁵A. M. Stirton in "International Socialist Review," Jan., 1910.

⁶Haywood in Int. Soc. Review, December, 1910.

⁷Haywood and Bohn, "Industrial Socialism."

⁸Haywood, in "International Socialist Review," March, 1911.

⁹"The Industrial Socialist," Bridgeport, Conn., April 6, 1912.

¹⁰Proceedings, Nat. Convention of the Soc. Party, 1908, P. 103.

¹¹"The National Socialist," June 1, 1912.

¹²La Monte, in "International Socialist Review," August, 1912.

¹³La Monte, in "International Socialist Review," Sept., 1912.

V. CONCLUSION

¹"International Socialist Review," September, 1912.

²Kautsky, "The Road To Power."

³Kautsky, "The Road To Power," Chap. V.

⁴Kautsky, in "The Evening World," Chicago, July 13, 1912.

⁵Quoted by Walling, "Labor Union Socialism," p. 74.

⁶"Miners' Magazine," June, 1912.

⁷"Socialist Bulletin," Boston, June 15, 1912.

The Rip-Saw Series

Order by Number.

- No. 1—LAW AND THE WHITE SLAVER—**
By Kate Richards O'Hare; The cause of White Slavery.....10c
- No. 2—CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL PROBLEM—**
By Kate Richards O'Hare—For minister or layman.....10c
- No. 3—COMMON SENSE AND THE LIQUOR QUESTION—**
By Kate Richards O'Hare—This settles the "wet" and "dry"....10c
- No. 4—PROSTITUTION FOR PROFIT—**
By H. G. Creel—Will work a revolution.....10c
- No. 5—TRICKS OF THE PRESS—**
By H. G. Creel—Tricks of newspapers exposed.....10c
- No. 6—NEWSPAPER FRAUDS—**
By H. G. Creel—Completes the story in No. 5.....10c
- No. 7—SOCIALISM AND FREE LOVE—**
By Allen W. Ricker—You have been waiting for this.....10c
- No. 8—A WAVE OF HORROR—**
By Henry M. Tichenor—From first to last this is great.10c
- No. 9—SOCIALISM IN ACTION—**
By Allen W. Ricker—Ricker's great speech10c
- No. 10—THE EVILS OF CAPITALISM—**
By H. M. Tichenor—Tichenor tears the hide off.....10c
- No. 11—MILITANT SOCIALISM—**
By James Oneal—The Way To Get It.....10c
- No. 12—THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF JESUS—**
By A. W. Ricker—An Eye Opener.....10c
- No. 13—WAR!—**
By Howard Caldwell—Shows Why Men Fight.....10c
- No. 14—RIP-SAW MOTHER GOOSE—**
By H. M. Tichenor—Catchy Jingles.....10c
- No. 15—SOCIALISM FOR THE FARMER—**
By Oscar Ameringer—For Farmers Who Farm.....10c
- No. 16—WOMAN UNDER CAPITALISM—**
By H. M. Tichenor—Every Woman Should Read It.....10c
- No. 19—FACT AND FRAUD—**
By H. G. CREEL—Socialism Made Plain.....10c
- No. 20—SABOTAGE—**
By James Oneal—Socialism vs. Syndicalism.....10c

QUANTITY PRICES—ALL OF ONE KIND OR ASSORTED.

Three copies, postpaid.....	\$.25	100 copies, express prepaid..	\$ 5.50
Seven copies, postpaid.....	.50	500 copies in one order (you	
Fifteen copies, postpaid.....	1.00	pay the express charges;	
Fifty copies, postpaid.....	3.00	shipping weight 35 lbs.)...	20.00

Princeton University Library



32101 045395116

